



Reference No. P-32718

Dispatch No. 073822

Dispatched date: March 13, 2002

RECEIVED
JUN-25 2002
TC 3100 MAIL ROOM

DECISION OF REFUSAL (Final Rejection)

Patent Application No. Patent Application No. 203279/1999

Drafting Date February 26, 2002

Examiner of JPO Hiroyuki Ishida

Title of the Invention Case

Applicant Fuji Photo Film No., Ltd.

Representative Shohei Oguri and 7 others

This patent application is rejected by the reason described in the notification of reason for refusal dated November 30, 2001.

In addition, the opinion and the amendment have been examined, but no basis sufficient for overthrow the reason for refusal has been found.

Remark:

It is identified that the members shown by the numerals 10 and 11 of Cited Document 2 [Utility Model Application No. 39929/1987, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 137748/1988)] or shown by numerals 18 and 16 in Fig. 1 of Cited Document 3 [Utility Model Application No. 108275/1988, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model

Publication No. 31886/1990)] correspond to "the locking portions" of the inventions of claims 1 to 7 of the written amendment dated February 4, 2002.

In addition, it is identified that the receiving direction can be properly selected by persons skilled in the art [for example, see Utility Model Application No. 57298/1993, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 21515/1995), Utility Model Application No. 90151/1991, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 16653/1993), or Cited Document 1 (Unexamined Patent Publication No. 260664/1987)].

Accordingly, the inventions of claims 1 to 7 of the written amendment dated February 4, 2002 fall under the provisions of Patent Law Section 29(2) by the same reason mentioned before. Therefore, the above-described amendment has been dismissed, and the inventions of claims 1 to 7 of the specification of the application fall under the provisions of Patent Law Section 29(2) as shown in the above-described the notification of reason for refusal.

Reference No. P-32718

Dispatch No. 073822

Dispatched date: March 13, 2002

DISMISSAL OF AMENDMENT

Patent Application No. Patent Application No. 203279/1999

Drafting Date February 26, 2002

Examiner of JPO Hiroyuki Ishida

Title of the Invention Case

Applicant Fuji Photo Film No., Ltd.

Representative Shohei Oguri and 7 others

Conclusion

The amendments about the specification and the drawings made by the written amendment dated February 4, 2002 are dismissed by the following reason.

Reason

It is identified that the members shown by the numerals 10 and 11 of Cited Document 2 [Utility Model Application No. 39929/1987, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 137748/1988)] or shown by numerals 18 and 16 in Fig. 1 of Cited Document 3 [Utility Model Application No. 108275/1988, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 31886/1990)] correspond to "the locking

portions" of the inventions of claims 1 to 7 of the written amendment dated February 4, 2002.

In addition, it is identified that the receiving direction can be properly selected by persons skilled in the art [for example, see Utility Model Application No. 57298/1993, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 21515/1995), Utility Model Application No. 90151/1991, the microfilm of (Unexamined Utility Model Publication No. 16653/1993), or Cited Document 1 (Unexamined Patent Publication No. 260664/1987)].

Accordingly, the inventions of claims 1 to 7 of the written amendment dated February 4, 2002 fall under the provisions of Patent Law Section 20(2) by the same reason shown in the notification of reason for refusal dated November 30, 2001, and thus should not be granted a patent.

Accordingly, by the amendments, the inventions specified by the matters described in the claims after the amendment of Patent Law Section 17bis(2)(4)(ii) should not be independently granted a patent at the case of the patent application, and since the amendments do not aim at the matters prescribed in Patent Law Section 17bis(2)(4) applied mutatis mutandis under Patent Law Section 17bis(5), it is

decided as the above-described conclusion under the provision
of Section 53(1).